

Remarks

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed May 21, 2003, the Examiner objected to the drawings because Figure 6 contained a spelling error. Further, the Examiner objected to several informalities in the specification. The Examiner then rejected claims 3, 4, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for reciting "the base station" without antecedent basis, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7-10 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,041,241 (Willey), the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 8, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0191583 (Harris), the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Willey, and the Examiner rejected claims 9, 13, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Harris.

2. Pending Claims

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-17 and has added new claims 18-21. Thus now pending in this application are claims 18-21, of which claims 18 and 20 are independent and claims 19 and 21 are dependent.

3. Response to Drawing Objections

Applicant submits herewith a copy of Figure 6, with the spelling error in box 122 corrected. Applicant submits that this change overcomes the drawing objection.

4. Response to Specification Objections

Applicant has amended the specification to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Applicant submits that these corrections overcome the objections to the specification.

5. Response to § 112 Rejections

Applicant has cancelled claims 3, 4, 11 and 12. Therefore, the rejections of those claims are now moot.

6. Response to § 102 and § 103 Rejections

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-17. Therefore, the rejections of those claims are now moot.

7. Claims 18-21

Independent claim 18 is directed to a method for reducing call setup latency in a mobile station, and independent claim 20 is directed to a mobile station that is arranged to carry out functions like those recited in claim 18.

Each of these claims recites a combination of mechanisms for reducing call setup latency, as described in Applicant's specification. In particular, each claim recites the functions of (i) responding to a user request to switch a mobile station from a normal mode to a push-to-talk (PTT) mode by switching the paging slot cycle index of the mobile station to a slot cycle index at which the mobile station will check for pages more often, and (ii) receiving and buffering in the mobile station a user speech signal and then transmitting the buffered speech signal once the mobile station establishes an initiating communication leg with a PTT server. Dependent claims 19 and 21, in turn, recite that the paging slot cycle index changes from a slot cycle index of 2 to a slot cycle index of 0. The specification as filed describes these mechanisms for reducing call setup latency at page 17, line 8 to page 23, line 9.

Applicant submits that the invention as recited in claims 18-21 patentably distinguishes over the Willey and Harris references. In particular, neither Willey nor Harris, nor a combination of Willey and Harris, discloses the combination of (i) having a mobile station


switch to a higher-frequency slot cycle index in response to a user request to switch the mobile station to a PTT mode and (ii) having the mobile station buffer a user speech signal and then transmit the buffered speech signal in response to establishment of an initiating communication leg with a PTT server, as recited in the claims.

Because Willey and Harris do not disclose or suggest the combination of elements as recited in any of claims 18-21, Applicant submits that claims 18-21 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable action.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF**

Dated: August 20, 2003

By: 
Lawrence H. Aaronson
Reg. No. 35,818

RECEIVED

SEP 03 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS